## **School District Study**

## An Analysis for Cottonwood Heights in Considering a Smaller School District



## Bennett Educational Consultants Incorporated Mike Bennett, President

Phone: H. 801-277-2256 C. 801-598-5591 E-mail mike@bennettedconsulting.com

Prepared with the cooperation of Jordan School District and Granite School District. Appreciation is expressed to Superintendents Barry Newbold and Steven Ronnenkamp

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL INFORMATION	1
CITY INFORMATION 2006-07	2
CITY INFORMATION 2005	3
CITY INFORMATION 2004	4
EXPLANATION - CITY INFORMATION TABLES	5
SCHOOLS & DEMOGRAPHICS	6,7
SCHOOLS, PROPERTIES & COSTS	8,9
SCHOOLS & ADDITIONAL FUNDING	10,11
STATE FUNDING	12
FEDERAL FUNDING	13
LOCAL TAXES (BY DISTRICT & CITY)	14
CURRENT & FUTURE FUNDING ISSUES	15
JORDAN ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS	16,17
SHARED BOUNDARY SCHOOLS	18
ANALYSIS OF ENROLLMENT & GROWTH	19
ADVANTAGES & DISADVANTAGES (STATUS QUO)	20
ADVANTAGES & DISADVANTAGES (COMBINING WITH SANDY, DRAPER & MIDVALE CITIES)	21
ADVANTAGES & DISADVANTAGES (COMBINING WITH HOLLADAY, SOUTH SALT LAKE & MILLCREEK	22

#### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

#### **EDUCATION FUNDING**

- Three Main Sources- Federal, State, Local (Property Tax)
- **State Funding** Basic School Program plus special categorical funding for additional programs. (see State Funding chart)
- Federal Funding Special Ed., NCLB monies and federal grants (see Federal Fund chart)
- **Federal and State funding follow the students** regardless of the school or district where they choose to enroll. (This includes charter schools)
- Local Funding Property Taxes stay with the district where students reside. All building construction, remodeling, property acquisition, maintenance equipment and most technology purchases are paid for with local funding. Also, some transportation costs, all sports programs, and some additional education programs are financed with local property taxes. Small amounts of local funding are transferred to a student's actual attendance area based on inter local district agreements.

**Example:** Granite currently bills Jordan \$308 and Jordan bills Granite \$447 for each student attending their respective districts on special permits. There are 1649 students residing in JSD boundaries but enrolled in GSD schools - \$507,982 to GSD. There are 686 students residing in GSD boundaries but enrolled in JSD schools - \$306,642 to JSD.

#### **ENROLLMENT** (Potential Students By City)

Cottonwood Heights	4844 - 415  to GSD =	4429
Draper City	6681 – 112 to GSD & AS	D = 6569
Midvale	3538 - 98 to GSD =	3440
Sandy	19322 - 550 to GSD =	18772
4 City TOTALS	<b>34385</b> - 1175 to GSD =	33210
<b>Actual 4 City Enr</b>	<b>collment</b> (projected) =	32,253

#### ENROLLMENT AND FUNDING PROJECTIONS FOR POSSIBLE 4 CITY DISTRICT

```
Student Enrollment – 32,253
State Funding – 40.6% of $317,085,626 = $128,736,764 (59.4%)
Federal Funding – 40.6% of $23,646,837 = $9,600,616 (4.4%)
Local Funding – $95,665,348 – Debt Service = $78,477,618 (36.2%)
```

Total Estimated Funding of New District = \$216,814,998

## **City Information 2006-07**

Cities & Districts	Popu- lation	Student Enrollment	Assessed Valuation	District Prop. Tax	% Local Funds	% of Students	School in Areas
North				.006477			
Holladay	26,000	6971	2,386,595,614	\$15,457,979	10%	10.1%.	5 Elem. 1H.S 2 Middle
South Salt Lake	22,038	3212	1,648,550,608	\$10,676,662	8.9%	5.2%	3 Elem. 1 Middle 1 H.S. 1 D.O.
County (Millcreek)	21,385	8240	3,813,312,511 (estimated)	\$24,698,825	18.6%	12%	8 Elem. 1 H.S. 3 Middle
TOTALS	69,423	18440	\$7,848,458,733	\$50,833,466	37.6%	26.9%	16 Elem 3 H.S 6 Middle
South	People	STUDENT POPULAT. (Potential)	Assessed Valuation	Tax Rate .007347	% Local Funding	% Potential Students	Schools In Areas
Cottonwood Heights	35,000	4,844	2,444,543,282	\$17,960,059	10.3%	5.7%	4 Elem 1 H.S. 1 Middle
Sandy	93,148	19,322	5,555,441,746	\$40,815,830	23.4%	22.2%	18 Elem 4 Middle 2 H.S.
Midvale	29,000	3,538	1,349,877,043	\$9,917,546	5.7%	5%	3 Elem 1 H.S. 1 Middle
Draper	33,000	6,681	2,902,118,583	\$21,321,865	12.3%	7.9%	3 Elem
White City Granite Other Cnty.	Included In Sandy	Included In Sandy	183,729,730 227,877,481 357,420,812	\$5,650,045	3.2%	Included In Sandy City	
TOTALS	190148	34,385	\$13,021,008,267 55.2%	4 CITIES \$95,665,345	54.9%	40.6%	30 Elem 4 H.S. 6 Middle
		Students	Prop. Value	PROP. TX.	STATE	FEDERAL	TOTAL
JORDAN (current)	N/A	(p) <b>84,602</b> (e) <b>79,362</b>	\$23,688,588,879 (after RDA)	\$174,040,062 33.8%	\$317,085,626 <b>61.6%</b>	\$23,646,837 <b>4.6%</b>	\$514,772,525 100%
4 CITY DISTRICT (new)	190148	(p) <b>34,385</b> (e) <b>32,253</b>	\$13,021,008,267 (after RDA ?)	BD \$95,665,348 AD \$78,477,618 36.2%	\$128,736,764 <b>59.4%</b>	\$9,600,616 4.4%	\$216,814,998 100%
WEBER	N/A	(e) <b>26,987</b>	\$5,814,811,320 (after RDA)	.006623 \$38,511,495 23%	\$121,117,313 <b>72.3%</b>	\$7,778,631 <b>4.7%</b>	\$167,407,439 100%
JORDAN (adjusted)	N/A	(p) <b>50,217</b> (e) <b>47,109</b>	\$10,667,580,612	BD \$78,374,715 AD \$95,562,445 31.7%	\$190,296,400 63%	\$14,046,221 5.3%	\$301,852,604 100%

NOTE: AD – After Debt Payment BD -- Before Debt Payment RDA – Redevelopment Funds to Cities

## **City Information 2005**

Cities & Districts	Popu- lation	Student Pop.	Assessed Valuation	District Prop. Tax	% Local Funds	% of Students	Schools in Areas
<u>North</u>				Tax Rate .006604			
Holladay	26,000	6971	1,621,933,614	10,711,249	10%	10.1%.	5 Elem. 2 Middle 1 H.S.
South Salt Lake	22,038	3212	1,438,143,607	9,497,500	8.9%	5.2%	3 Elem. 1 Middle 1 H.S. Old D.O. Hartvigsen & Jones Center
County (Millcreek)	21,385	8063	3,013,312,511 (estimated)	19,899,915	18.6%	12%	8 Elem. 3 Middle 1 H.S.
TOTALS	69,423	18440	6,073,389,732	40,108,664	37.6%	26.9%	16 Elem 6 Middle 3 H.S.
South	Residents	STUDENT POPULAT. (Potential)	Assessed Valuation	Tax Rate .008655	% Local Funding	% Potential Students	Schools In Area
Cottonwood Heights	35,000	4,844	2,081,869,500	18,018,580 - 127,820 = 17,890,760	9.7% Adjustment <b>9.6%</b>	5.7% Adjustment <b>5.2%</b>	5 Elem. 1 Middle 1 H.S.
Sandy .	93,148	19,322	4,954,811,511	42,883,893 - 169,400= 42,714,493	23.1% Adjustment 23%	22.8% Adjustment 22.2%	18 Elem 4 Middle 2 H.S.
Midvale	29,000	3,538	1,228,112,797	10,629,316	5.7%	5%	3 Elem 1 Middle 1 H.S.
Draper	33,000	6,681	2,217,237,274	19,190,188 - 14,168 = 19,176,020	11.3% Adjustment 11.3%	7.9% Adjustment <b>7.8%</b>	3 Elem
White City Granite Other Cnty. Island Areas	Included In Sandy City	Included In Sandy City	167,729,730 207,877,481 327,420,812 <b>703,028,023</b>	6,084,707	3.3%	Included In Sandy City	
TOTALS	190148	37,031	11,185,059,105 52%	Jordan Total (East) 96,495,296	51.9%	43.8%	30 Elem 6 Middle 4 H.S.
Jordan		Potential	Prop. Value	PROP. TX.	STATE	FED.	TOTAL
	N/A	84,590 (actual) 77,240	21,446,110,456 (assessed) \$185,616,086	(collected) 181,210,563 36%	\$292,562,416 <b>58.2%</b>	\$29,047,982 <b>5.8%</b>	\$507,226,484 (actual) \$502,826,961

## **City Information 2004**

Cities & Districts	Popu- lation	Student Pop.	Assessed Valuation	PROP TAX TO DIST.	% of Dist. Funds	% of Students	Schools & Facilities
North				.006604			
Holladay	26,000	6971	1,621,933,614	10,711,249	10%	10.1%.	5 Elem. 2 Middle 1 H.S.
South Salt Lake	22,038	3212	1,438,143,607	9,497,500	8.9%	5.2%	3 Elem. 1 Middle 1 H.S. Old D.O. Hartvigsen & Jones Center
County (Millcreek)	21,385	8063	3,013,312,511 (estimated)	19,899,915	18.6%	12%	8 Elem. 3 Middle 1 H.S.
TOTALS	69,423	18440	6,073,389,732	40,108,664	37.6%	26.9%	16 Elem 6 Middle 3 H.S.
South				.008856			
Cottonwood Heights	35,000	4,844	2,081,869,500	18,437,036	10.6%	5.7%	5 Elem. 1 Middle 1 H.S.
Sandy	93,148	19,322	4,954,811,511	43,879,810	25.4%	22.8%	18 Elem 4 Middle 2 H.S.
Midvale	29,000	3,538	1,228,112,797	10,876,166	6.3%	5%	3 Elem 1 Middle 1 H.S.
Draper	33,000	6,681	2,217,237,274	19,635,853	11.4%	7.9%	3 Elem 2 Middle 2 H.S.
White City Granite Other Cnty. TOTAL	Included In Sandy City	Included In Sandy City	167,729,730 207,877,481 327,420,812 <b>703,028,023</b>	6,226,016	3.6%	Included In Sandy City	
TOTALS	190148	37,031	11,185,059,105 57%	Jordan Total (East) 96,495,296	57.3%	43.8%	30 Elem 8 Middle 4 H.S.
	Populat.	Potential	Prop. Value	LOCAL	STATE	FEDERAL	TOTAL
Jordan	N/A	82,587 (actual) 75,716	19,627112397	\$172,545,402 <b>36.5%</b>	\$274,999,738 <b>59%</b>	\$21,048,477 <b>4.5%</b>	\$465,920,873

# EXPLANATION OF CITY INFORMATION TABLES AND PROPERTY TAXES (BY CITY) GENERATED FOR JORDAN & GRANITE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

**CITY INFORMATION TABLES** – The primary purpose of these tables is to establish a statistical overview of the number of students in each city as part of this complete study. Comparisons are then made with regard to students being served by each city (as a percentage of the entire school district) and local revenues generated (as a percentage of all local school district revenue).

- **COLUMN #1** This is a **list of cities and unincorporated county areas** contiguous to those city boundaries in both Granite and Jordan School Districts,
- **COLUMN #2** This column provides a current estimate of the **resident population** in each district and/or city, (based on projected adjustment from the 2000 census)
- **COLUMN #3** -- This column, in the case of Granite District, is an estimate of the actual **number of students** from each city enrolled in Granite District schools. The number of students in Jordan District is based on students who reside in each city's boundaries, regardless of what schools they might attend.
- **COLUMN #4** This column provides information about the **assessed valuation** of each city's properties. It also includes the assessed valuation of all cities combined as a percent of each district's total assessed valuation.
- **COLUMN #5** This column provides the **total tax rate** assessed by each school district It also lists the exact **amount (in dollars)** assessed to each city.
- **COLUMN #6** This column provides information about the **local district funding** being provided by each city **as a percentage of the district total**.
- **COLUMN #7** This column provides the total **number of potential students** (living within the boundaries of each city) **as a percentage of the district wide total**.
- **COLUMN #8** This column lists the total **number and type of schools** located within the boundaries of each respective city.

#### **PROPERTY**

- **TAX TABLES** These tables are provided to **disaggregate the local district assessment** data for each specific component of local tax levies. Jordan tables also have:
  - 1. A **three year history** of local district tax rates assessed in each category
  - 2. A two year breakdown of tax rates by % and dollar amount in four cities.
  - 3. Two years of total dollars generated for Jordan district by each of the four cities considered in this study. Also, the total of all four cities is compared to the total local tax assessment by Jordan School District.

## **Jordan Schools & Demographics**

Jordan	Enrolled	City Resident	Out of City	Special Prog.	Special Ed.	Red. Lunch	Free Lunch
COTTNWD Hgts	5469	3911	1558	4	386	256	615
Bella Vista	393	308	85	2 BH	25	21	70
Butler	568	497	71	2 IH	24	23	58
Canyon View	670	632	38	No	37	26	75
Oakdale	510	178	332	No	58	31	96
Ridgecrest	429	411	18	No	22	42	84
Butler Middle	1023	929	94	No	72	58	125
Brighton High	1876	956	920	No	148	55	107
SANDY	21624	15831	5793	8	1586	1111	2726
Altara	647	584	63	No	58	45	75
Alta View	591	515	76	1 ALP	39	52	112
Bellview	549	401	148	No	50	48	143
Brookwood	586	404	182	No	17	8	29
Crescent	742	627	115	No	29	53	138
East Sandy	696	649	47	No	48	59	116
Edgemont	616	502	114	No	48	64	118
Granite	590	570	20	No	60	23	40
Lone Peak	818	470	348	No	29	6	34
Park Lane	559	546	13	No	30	16	29
Peruvian Park	567	427	140	1 ALP	39	28	71
Quail Hollow	582	554	28	No	35	18	42
Sandy	615	558	57	Title 1	58	76	301
Siver Mesa	493	471	22	No	24	27	60
Sprucewood	899	417	482	No	64	36	63
Sunrise	588	527	61	No	37	23	50
Willow Canyon	509	442	67	No	20	24	49
Albion Middle	1036	913	123	No	68	38	75
Crescent View Md	1346	390	958	No	85	59	101
Eastmont Middle	919	874	45	No	66	60	132
Indian Hills	1218	875	343	1 LD	98	33	71
Mt. Jordan Midle	639	498	141	3 SC	74	68	183
Union Middle	978	620	358	1 ID	88	100	243
Alta High	2307	1278	1029	No	157	58	117
Jordan High	1801	1491	310	No	216	89	218
Valley High	733	228	505	No	49	n/a	n/a

MIDVALE	4490	2212	2278	5	456	393	1970
Copperview	470	259	211	Title 1	28	70	271
East Midvale	588	534	54	Title 1	61	53	338
Midvale	623	600	23	Title 1	39	33	548
Midvalley	569	277	292	No	73	77	154
Midvale Middle	771	393	378	2 S.C.	65	58	338
Hillcrest High	1469	449	1020	No	190	102	321
DRAPER		2143	46	0	88	53	133
Draper	919	889	30	No	55	29	69
Oak Hollow	1270	1254	16	No	33	24	64
Willow Springs	Fall 2006						
ALPINE From	114 Utah	36 Special					
Draper	County	Permits					

#### CHART EXPLANATION

This chart is a statistical snapshot of the student enrollment and the various learning and socioeconomic status of these students' families. They are enrolled in schools located in four specific cities within Jordan School District. These cities are from top to bottom:

#### Cottonwood Heights, Sandy, Midvale and Draper.

- **COLUMN #1** This column lists all of the **Schools by City** location.
- **COLUMN #2** This column lists s total **Student Enrollment** in each school listed.
- COLUMN #3 This column lists the actual **Number of Students Residing in the City** where each specific school is located.
- COLUMN #4 This column lists the number of **Students Who do not Reside in a City** where a specific school is located.
- COLUMN #5 -- This column lists the number and type of Special Programs housed in a specific school. Title One programs serve all students in a school However, the other programs listed are based on specific qualifying criteria and students attend those programs regardless of where they reside. These programs are limited to 12 students each and include:

  Title One based on a federal govt. formula for school wide poverty ALPS A gifted and talented program based on specific district criteria
  - LD A program for students with serious learning disabilities
  - **IH** A program for students with intellectual handicaps based on I.Q.
  - **BH** A program for students with serious behavioral handicaps.
  - **SC** A designation for Self Contained without specifying the type.
- **COLUMN #6** This column specifies the number of students with a **variety of learning handicaps.** They are served for part of the day by special education
  teachers who also track their learning progress in other classes. These
  teachers/programs are funded by state and federal special education dollars.
- COLUMNS #7 & #8 These numbers represent the students who are on free or reduced lunch. This is based on yearly family income and reflects economic poverty level.

## **Jordan Schools, Properties & Costs**

Schools, Facillities and Other Property	Students Enrolled	Student Capacity	Capital Remodeling Needs	FCI (Facility Construct. Index)	Yearly Utility Costs	Cost Per Student
COTTNWD Hgts	5492		\$51,931,043	53%	\$1,090,509	\$16.35
Bella Vista	399	500	\$5,565,997	101%	\$64,345	\$11.17
Butler	569	716	\$3,124,149	45%	\$65,662	\$9.72
Canyon View	670	572 + 1 port	\$1,642,000	28%	\$88,849	\$11.36
Oakdale	513	620	\$2,656,253	41%	\$87,766	\$13.96
Ridgecrest	425	716	\$1,399,563	23%	\$83,489	\$16.07
Butler Middle	1023	1412	\$17,859,863	105%	\$72,269	\$15.13
Brighton High	1893	2072 + 2  pt.	\$4,766,205	15%	\$452,789	\$18.08
CLSD Mt.View &	Cottonwd	Heights	\$14,917,013	122%	\$53,052	\$24.64
SANDY	21711		\$118,524,039	54%	\$4,539,109	\$16.75
Altara	649	714	\$1,102,338	18%	\$99,578	\$12.74
Alta View	588	620 + 3 port	\$7,442,899	118%	\$76,979	\$11.07
Bellview	549	642	\$1,793,003	29%	\$96,139	\$14.52
Brookwood	586	596	\$2,595,742	44%	\$91,255	\$12.92
Crescent	739	714	\$3,869,677	62%	\$97,566	\$10.85
East Sandy	697	692	\$2,067,810	34%	\$79,853	\$9.48
Edgemont	620	692	\$5,411,725	73%	\$82,549	\$10.99
Granite	595	668	\$1,153,376	20%	\$109,620	\$14.91
Lone Peak	821	760	\$2,695,364	38%	\$76,167	\$7.83
Park Lane	557	644	\$3,457,450	58%	\$102,015	\$15.28
Peruvian Park	570	668	\$4,793,316	70%	\$69,372	\$10.03
Quail Hollow	584	714	\$1,157,889	18%	\$107,499	\$15.16
Sandy	620	764 + 3 port	\$1,833,052	26%	\$76,979	\$11.07
Siver Mesa	491	692	\$3,579,113	61%	\$115,004	\$19.71
Sprucewood	897	642 + 6 port	\$1,941,787	31%	\$121,562	\$11.42
Sunrise	591	692	\$1,075,686	19%	\$107,794	\$15.33
Willow Canyon	510	644	\$1,126,012	19%	\$106,346	\$17.42
Albion Middle	1037	1250	\$6,569,263	53%	\$178,118	\$14.20
Crescent View Md	1351	1250 + 5 pt.	\$5,843,393	47%	\$158,325	\$9.71
Eastmont Middle	924	1338	\$7,628,272	44%	\$235,123	\$19.62
Indian Hills	1218	1250 + 2 pt	\$8,990,907	74%	\$209,039	\$14.07
Mt. Jordan Midle	647	1255	\$17,108,984	103%	\$245,076	\$30.52
Union Middle	972	1434	\$8,660,182	47%	\$247,040	\$21.49
Alta High	2329	2432 + 6 pt	\$7,332,155	21%	\$459,437	\$15.78
Jordan High	1825	2500	\$937,300	2%	\$507,969	\$21.56
Valley High	744		\$3,605,641	127%	\$63,333	\$9.52
JATC			\$1,738,119	15%	\$107,106	\$59.50
Admin. Office			\$1,649,329	33%	\$133,970	N/A
Admin Aux. Offic			\$274,593	9%	\$138,206	N/A
Central Warehouse			\$645,304	13%		
Auxilliary W.H.			\$142,285	21%		
Auxilliary W.H. 2			\$70,601	22%		

Transportation			\$3,688,922	63%	\$67,960	N/A
MIDVALE	4563		\$49,091,056	76%	\$1,174,202	\$19.51
Copperview	468	668	\$4,060,869	60%	\$78,950	\$13.80
East Midvale	593	668	\$2,821,632	41%	\$111,303	\$15.37
Midvale	631	741 + 5 port	\$6,556,677	117%	\$110,498	\$14.26
Midvalley	580	716 + 2 port	\$8,322,233	118%	\$87,948	\$12.37
Midvale Middle	769	1264	\$15,490,472	94%	\$218,216	\$23.71
Hillcrest High	1522	2317 + 4 pt	\$6,535,917	17%	\$363,220	\$18.37
Jordan Valley			\$1,021,019	16%	\$187,773	\$65.11
Jordan Resource			\$4,282,237	145%	\$16,294	\$32.72
DRAPER	2191		\$2,565,991	22%	\$215,143	\$8.14
Draper	916	620 + 7 port	\$2,378,231	41%	\$92,989	\$8.39
Oak Hollow	1275	764 + 7 port	\$187,760	3%	\$122,154	\$7.95
<b>Other Schools</b>						
Willow Springs	Fall 2006					
Genesis Y.C.			N/A			
So. Pk. Acad.			N/A			
LAND						
Archie Smith	11.46 Acrs					
NuTeam	53.41 Acrs					
Berrett/Cosgrove	21.21 Acrs					
Thorne	2.5 Acrs					
	44 K-12	6 Special	7 District	5 Land	62 Total	
TOTALS	Schools	Schools	Facilities	Parcels	Properties	

**CHART EXPLANATION** – This chart is a snapshot of all schools and facilities located in four cities within Jordan School District. The primary purpose of this chart is three fold:

- 1. To list all properties that might be part of an asset redistribution or shared usage agreement in the event that two or more of these cities decide to vote on forming a new and separate school district.
- 2. To increase awareness of utility costs to maintain a school or other facility with student enrollments at and/or below the capacity of a specific facility.
- 3. To increase awareness about schools (currently in operation) that have extensive remodeling needs in order to create an optimal and safe learning environment.

**COLUMN #1** – A list (by city) of all schools, facilities and properties located therein.

COLUMN #2 – Actual student enrollments as of June 2006

**COLUMN #3** – Student enrollment capacity of each school

COLUMN #4 - Remodeling needs as per a study done by JSD in 2001

**COLUMN #5** – FCI or Facility Construction Index refers to the percentage of need (measured in dollars) to bring a facility up to optimum condition.

**COLUMN #6** – Annual utility costs currently incurred by each school and facility.

COLUMN #7 - Cost of annual utilities on a per student basis at each school/facility

## **Jordan Schools & Additional Funding**

Jordan	Enroll ment	Special Educat.	Special Ed. (Federal)	Special Ed. (State)	Title One	Applied Techn.
COTTNWD Hgts	5492	386	\$554,682	\$1,014,022	none	\$265,097
Bella Vista	399	25	\$35,925	\$65,675	Hone	φ203,071
Butler	569	24	\$34,488	\$63,048		
Canyon View	670	37	\$53,169	\$97,199		
Oakdale	513	58	\$83,346	\$152,366		
Ridgecrest	425	22	\$31,614	\$57,794		
Butler Middle	1023	72	\$103,464	\$189,144		\$7,136
Brighton High	1893	148	\$212,676	\$388,796		\$257,961
SANDY	21711	1608	\$2,310,696	\$4,224,216	\$509,400	\$669,446
Altara	649	58	\$83,346	\$152,366	, ,	7
Alta View	588	39	\$56,043	\$102,453		
Bellview	549	50	\$71,850	\$131,350		
Brookwood	586	17	\$24,429	\$44,659		
Crescent	739	51	\$73,287	\$133,977		
East Sandy	697	48	\$68,976	\$126,096	\$509,400	
Edgemont	620	48	\$68,976	\$126,096		
Granite	595	29	\$41,673	\$76,183		
Lone Peak	821	60	\$86,220	\$157,620		
Park Lane	557	30	\$43,110	\$78,810		
Peruvian Park	570	39	\$56,043	\$102,453		
Quail Hollow	584	35	\$50,295	\$91,945		
Sandy	620	58	\$83,346	\$152,366		
Siver Mesa	491	24	\$34,488	\$63,048		
Sprucewood	897	64	\$91,968	\$168,128		
Sunrise	591	37	\$53,169	\$97,199		
Willow Canyon	510	20	\$28,740	\$52,540		
Albion Middle	1037	68	\$97,716	\$178,636		\$10,237
Crescent View Md	1351	66	\$94,842	\$173,382		\$11,152
Eastmont Middle	924	85	\$122,145	\$223,295		\$8,850
Indian Hills	1218	98	\$140,826	\$257,446		\$10,985
Mt. Jordan Midle	647	74	\$106,338	\$194,398		\$8,872
Union Middle	972	88	\$126,456	\$231,176		\$9,000
Alta High	2329	157	\$225,609	\$412,439		\$343,361
Jordan High	1825	216	\$310,392	\$567,432		\$266,989
Valley High	744	49	\$70,413	\$128,723		
J.A.T.C. (EAST)						\$1,359,809
MIDVALE	4563	456	\$655,272	\$1,197,912	\$1,842,504	\$258,000
Copperview	468	28	\$40,236	\$73,556	\$452,553	
East Midvale	593	61	\$87,657	\$160,247	\$527,693	
Midvale	631	39	\$56,043	\$102,453	\$862,312	

District Total	75489		\$11,711,471	\$16,121,079	\$4,444000	\$9,017,796
4 City Totals	33955	2538	\$3,647,106	\$6,667,326	\$2,351,904	\$2,552,35
Oak Hollow	1270	33	\$47,021	\$86,691		
Draper	919	55	\$79,035	\$144,485		
DRAPER	2189	88	\$126,456	\$231,176	none	
Hillcrest High	1522	190	\$273,030	\$499,130		\$250,000
Midvale Middle	769	65	\$93,405	\$170,755		\$8,000
Midvalley	580	73	\$104,901	\$191,771		

#### NCLB FUNDING (No Child Left Behind)

Title 1A	Title 2A	Title 2D	Title 3A	Title 4A	Title 5	Total
Poverty	Qual. Tch.	Technology	ESL	At Risk	Innov. Prog.	
\$4,444,160	\$1,798,184	\$96,141	\$316,189	\$187,070	\$221,350	\$7,063,094

**CHART EXPLANATIONS**– These charts represent funding (over and above the regular education funding allocated to schools in the four cities included in this study. The NCLB funding chart is based primarily on a poverty formula used by the federal government for all of Jordan District.

COLUMN #1 – These are K-12 schools located in four cities within Jordan School District

**COLUMN #2** – Total **current student enrollment** in each school listed on the chart

**COLUMN #3** – Number of **special education students** who have been identified with specific disabilities that require specific accommodations and instructional interventions

**COLUMN #4** – Total amount of **federal funding** allocated to each school to be used in teaching and meeting the educational needs of qualified special education students.

**COLUMN #5** – Total amount of **state funding** for special education students at each school

COLUMN #6 - Amount of federal funding given to each school that qualifies as a Title 1 school

COLUMN #7 – Applied technology money from the State provided to specific schools for salaries and benefits of teachers who teach applied technology classes.

Note: This does not include the funding of equipment and other costs associated with applied technology courses and the resources needed to run these programs

**ASSUMPTION**: 43.8% of the current student population of JSD resides in Sandy, Cottonwood Heights, Midvale and/or Draper combined: It should, therefore, be safe to assume that this same percentage of the funding would remain in a district formed by a coalition of these four cities.

STATE SPECIAL ED. FUNDING = \$7,012,669 FEDERAL SPECIAL ED. FUNDING = \$5,094,490 APPLIED TECHNOLOGY FUNDING = \$3,922,741 NCLB FUNDING (including Title One) = \$3,072,446

#### TOTAL ADDITIONAL FUNDING = \$19,102,346

Note: The NCLB funding is a conservative estimate. Currently, **52.9%** of Jordan District's entire Title One budget goes to one Sandy school and 3 Midvale schools. This would give **\$3,736,377** of all NCLB monies to the new district.

### SCHOOL DISTRICT STATE FUNDING

DISTRICT	REGULAR FUNDING	SPED. FUNDING	APPLIED TECH.	CLASS SIZE RED.	S.S & RET.	TRANSP.	QUAL. TEAC.	LOCAL BLOCK GRANT	SPEC. INTERV. GRANT	HIGHLY IMP. SCHL.	AT - RISK
GRANITE	\$166,279362	26,746,965	7,282,647	9,550,390	39,939,716	5,178,233	8,378,005	2,606,845	2,587,738	1,556,742	913,354
JORDAN	\$193,499809	28,008,217	9,042,769	11,041,166	45,985,435	7,855,135	8,994,190	3,047,988	2,121,352	123,083	722,554
4 CITY	\$78,560,922	11,371,336	3,671,364	4,482,713	18,670,987	3,189,185	3,651,641	1,237,483	861,269	123,083	293,357
WEBER	\$71,254,261	12,661,088	4,172,934	3,989,892	17,526,473	3,433,349	3,521,134	1,147,661	722,258	66,785	304,257

## SCHOOL DISTRICT STATE FUNDING (CONT.)

DISTRICT	ADULT	ACC.	SCHOOL	READ	TOTAL	ONE	MAT.	TRANSP.	UPASS	TOTAL
	ED.	LRNG. PROG.	TRUST LANDS	ACH.		TIME	BOOKS SUPP.			
GRANITE	955,362	1,337,815	1,862,883	1,730,849	\$276,876,332		1,106,097	413,465	191,365	\$1,710,927
JORDAN	1,462,037	1,796,158	2,082,971	1,302,762	\$317,085,626		1,107,226	627,208	213,104	\$1,947,538
4 CITY	593,587	729,240	845,686	528,921	\$128,736,764		449,550	254,646	865,520	\$1,569,716
WEBER	263,168	538,145	797,648	718,260	\$121,117,313		455,797	274,142	86,149	\$816,088

#### FEDERAL FUNDING

DISTRICT	SPED. PRE- SCHOOL	SPED. IDEA K-12	NCLB Inc. Title One	TOTAL
GRANITE	\$408,914	\$13,097,235	\$13,682,712	\$27,188,861
JORDAN	\$356,705	\$12,600,280	\$7,063,094	\$20,020,079

<sup>\*</sup> NCLB Funding includes: Quality Teaching, Ed. Technology, Safe & Drug Free Schools, and Innovative Programs

### TOTAL DISTRICT FUNDING BY AMOUNT & PERCENTAGE

DISTRICT	STATE	LOCAL	FEDERAL	TOTAL	DEBT SERVICE
GRANITE 06-07					
AMOUNT	\$276,876,332	\$106,795,443	\$27,188,861	\$410,578,330	0
PERCENT	67.4%	26%	6.6%		0
JORDAN 04-05					
AMOUNT	\$274,999,738	\$169,872,658	\$21,048,477	\$465,920,873	\$32,561,626
PERCENT	59%	36.5%	4.5%		
AMOUNT <b>05-06</b>	\$292,562,416	\$181,210,563	\$29,047,982	\$502,826,961	\$33,903,351
PERCENT	58.2%	36%	5.8%		
AMOUNT 06-07	\$316,085,626	\$173,239,702	\$23,646,837	\$512,972,165	\$35,407,490
PERCENT	61.6%	33.8%	4.6%		

## **School Taxes, Revenue & Expenditures**

	<b>,</b>											
Districts	Assessed						M&O Pa	roperty <b>T</b>	axes			
	Value											
GRANITE		Basic	Rec.	Trans.	Debt	Capital	Voted	Board	Read.	10%	OTHER	
OMI (III		Levy			Service	Outlay	Leeway	Leeway		Basic	TOTAL	TOTAL
Local Ta Rt. 05-06	\$16,171,326,970	.00172	.000243	.00007	.0000	.001388	.001600	.0004	.000121	.000992	.00007	.006604
Local Rev. 05-06	\$106,795,443	27,81,682	3,929,633	1,131,993	0	22,445,801	25,874,124	6,468,530	1,956,731	16,041956	1,131,993	\$106,795,443
Local Tax Rt. 06-07	\$17,032,267,905	.001593	.000220	.000070	.0000	.001411	.001600	.00040	.000121	.000992	.000070	.006477
JORDAN												
Local Tax Rt. 04-05	\$19,627,112,797											.008856
Local Rev 04-05	\$172,545,402											168,308,726
Local Tax Rt .05-06	\$21,446,110,456	.00172	.000100	.00016	.001784	.002400	.001200	.000521	.000	.00072	.00005	.008655
Local Rev. 05-06	\$185,616,086	36,887310	2,144,611	3,431,377	38,259,861	51,470,655	25,735,332	11,173,423	0	15,419199	1,072,305	\$181,210,563
Local Tax Rt. 06-07	\$23,688,588,879	.001515	.000020	.000140	.001320	.002400	.001200	.000400	.000049	.000236	.000067	.007347
Projct. Rev. 06-07	\$174,040,062	35,888212	473,772	3,316,402	31,268,937	56,852,613	28,426,306	9,475,436	1,160,741	5,590,507	1,587,135	\$169,915,313
Fund Balance 04-05	\$79,757,224											
Fund Balance 05-06	\$78, 943,447											
Proj. Bal. 06-07	\$70,765,674											
Sandy Rev. 05-06	\$42,714,493 <b>23%</b>	8,473,416	492,640	788,225	8,788,707	11,823,372	5,911,686	2,566,570	0	3,547,011	246,320	\$42,638,037
Draper Rev. 05-06	\$19,176,020 <b>11.3%</b>	3,814,726	221,786	354,858	3,956,669	5,322,873	2,661,436	1,155,507	0	1,596,861	110,893	\$19,195,609
C.H. Rev. 05-06	\$17,890,760 <b>9.6%</b>	3,544,656	206,085	329,735	3,676,550	4,946,032	2,473,016	1,073,701	0	1,483,809	103,042	\$17,836,626
Midvale Rev. 05-06	\$10,629,316 <b>5.7%</b>	2,093,035	121,688	194,700	2,170,916	2,920,514	1,460,257	633,995	0	876,154	60,844	\$10,532,103
County Rev. 05-06	\$6,084,707 <b>3.3%</b>	1,215,310	70,658	113,052	1,260,531	1,695,782	847,891	368,126	0	508,735	35,328	\$6,115,413
4 CITY TOTAL 05-06	\$96,495,296 51.9%	19,141143	1,112,857	1,780570	19,853,373	26,708,573	13,354,286	5,797,899	0	8,012,570	556,427	\$96,317,788
Sandy Rev. 06-07	\$40,815,830 <b>22.2%</b>	8,416,494	111,109	777,762	7,333,183	13,333,060	6,666,530	2,222,176	272,216	1,311,084	372,214	\$40,815,828
Draper Rev, 06-07	\$21,321,865 <b>12.3%</b>	4,396,710	58,042	402,297	3,830,796	6,965,085	3,482,542	1,160,847	142,204	684,890	194,442	\$21,317,855
C.H. Rev. 06-07	\$17,960,059 <b>10.4%</b>	3,703843	48,891	342,236	3,226,797	5,866,904	2,933,452	977,817	119,783	576,912	163,784	\$17,960,419
Midvale Rev. 06-07	\$9,917,546 <b>5.7%</b>	2,045,064	26,997	188,983	1,781,838	3,239,705	1,619,852	539,951	66,144	318,571	90,442	\$9,917,547
Cnty. Rev. 06-07	\$5,650,045 <b>3.3%</b>	1,165,077	15,381	107,664	1,015,116	1,845,666	922,833	307,611	37,682	181,490	51,525	\$5,650,045
4 CITY TOTAL 06-07	\$95,665,345 55.2%	19,727188	\$260,420	1,818852	17,187,730	31,250,420	15,625,209	5,208,402	638,029	3,072,94 7	872,407	\$95,661,694

#### **CURRENT AND FUTURE FUNDING ISSUES**

#### MINIMUM STATE SCHOOL PROGRAM =

- Adjusted Jordan District = **47,109** & growing = **\$188,348,862** & Growing
- New 4 City District = 32,253 & stable = \$128,736,764 & Maintaining LOCAL FUNDING
  - Adjusted Jordan District = \$78,374,717 + \$17,187,730 (debt serv) = \$95,562,447
  - New 4 City District = \$95,665,345 \$17,187,730 (debt service) = \$78,374,717
  - Jordan Transportation Fleet of 310 buses -- annual M & O cost of 12.5 million Funding- State- \$7,870,000 + \$628,633 + \$3,011,209 local = \$11,509,842 Current Budget \$12,500,000 minus \$11,509,842 = (\$990,158) deficit.
  - New 4 City School District 40.2% of \$12,500,000 = \$5,025,000 cost per year Funding -State \$3,157,764 + \$1,818,852 local = \$4,976,616 in revenue. New 4 city trans. budget - \$5,075,000 minus = \$4,976,616 = (\$98,384)

#### FEDERAL FUNDING

- Adjusted Jordan District = \$14,046,221
- New 4 City District = **\$9,600,616**

#### **TOTALS**

- New 4 City School District = \$216,814,998 = \$6722 per student
- Adjusted Jordan District = \$301,852,604 = \$6407 per student
- Weber School District = \$167,814,998 = \$6203 per student

#### BONDING AND DEBT SERVICE

- Bonds have been issued in Jordan District every year since 1997. The total JSD indebtedness (including the \$25,000,000 worth of bonds issued in 2006) equals \$171,915,000 in outstanding debt. This will be retired in specific increments starting in 2007 and finished by 2021. (see JSD bond schedule).
- Jordan District also has current voter authorization to **issue an additional \$211,000,000** in bonds over the next four years using the following schedule:

2007 – 15 million 2009 – 89 million 2008 – 57 million 2010 – 50 million

Assumption -- If cities and their citizens decide on a vote to form a new school
and are only held financially accountable for bonding debt already issued then:
The formation of any new district would not involve debt service obligations
for the 211 million dollars of JSD bonds authorized but not yet issued.

## **Jordan Elementary Enrollment Projections**

<b>Elemenatary Schools</b>	2006	2015
ALTA AREA	6,101	7,089
Altara	646	590
Crescent	744	629
Draper	950	1045
Lone Peak	815	865
Oak Hollow	1467	2581
Sprucewood	888	830
Sunrise	591	549
BRIGHTON AREA	4,296	3,920
Bella Vista	399	360
Brookwood	588	551
Butler	563	497
Canyon View	650	580
Granite	614	585
Quail Hollow	581	523
Ridgecrest	413	375
Silver Mesa	488	449
HILLCREST AREA	4,118	3,957
Copperview	455	425
East Midvale	611	555
East Sandy	714	706
Midvale	641	711
Midvalley	581	520
Oakdale	536	488
Peruvian Park	580	552
JORDAN AREA	3,455	3,348
Alta View	590	575
Bell View	554	539
Edgemont	611	551
Park Lane	550	520
Sandy	630	648
Willow Canyon	520	515
<b>Area Elementary Totals</b>	17,960	18,314
District Elem. Totals	43,768	57,505

**Grades 7-9** 

Middle Schools	2006	2015
ALTA AREA	2,665	3,211
Crescent View Middle	1410	1836
Indian Hills Middle	1255	1375
BRIGHTON AREA	2,048	1,883
Albion Middle	1034	950
Butler Middle	1014	933
HILLCREST AREA	1,740	1,756
Midvale Middle	790	875
Union Middle	950	881
JORDAN AREA	1,622	1,500
Eastmont Middle	930	861
Mount Jordan Middle	692	639
Area M.S. Totals	8075	8350
District M.S. Totals	17,703	22,254

### **Grades 10 – 12**

High Schools	2006	2015
Alta	2,467	2,648
Brighton	1,950	1,908
Hillcrest	1,644	1,575
Jordan	1,993	1,940
Area H.S. Totals	8054	8071
District H.S. Totals	17,736	21,483
<b>District School Totals</b>	79208	114494

## **Enrollment Projections If Split Occurs**

ALL SCHOOLS	2006	2015		
NEW 4 CITY AREA	34089	34735		
Adjusted Jordan Dist.	45118	79759		

### SHARED BOUNDARY SCHOOLS

SCHOOL	COTT.	SANDY	MIDVALE	DRAPER	OTHER	CITIES
	HGTS.		+		PERMITS	
Alta Area	None	4854	None	3174	162	2 Cities 8190 Students
Crescent		627		48	67	2
Lone Peak		470		340	8	2
Sprucewood		417		456	26	2
Sunrise		527		118	-57	2
Crescent View		390		926	32	2
Indian Hills		875		329	14	2
Alta High		1278		957	72	2
Brighton	1683	2936	165	None	207	4 Cities
Area						4991 Students
Bella Vista	308		46		39	2
Brookwood	124	404			58	2
Granite	9	570			11	2
Oakdale	178	206	119		7	2
Albion Middle	108	913			15	2
Brighton High	956	843			77	2
Hillcrest Area	146	2053	1671	None	401	4 Cities
						4271 Students
Copperview		181	259		30	2
Midvalley		306	277			2
Midvale Middl	23	182	393		173	3
Union Middle	32	620	293		33	3
Hillcrest High	91	764	449		165	3
Jordan Area	None	1989	None	237	214	2 Cities
						2440 Students
Mount Jordan		498		78	63	2
Jordan High		1491		159	151	2
TOTALS	1829	11832	1836	3411	984	4 Cities
			2			19892 Kids

## ANALYSIS OF ENROLLMENT AND GROWTH PROJECTION CHARTS

#### **ENROLLMENT CHARTS**

- These **charts are divided by high school feeder areas** and they address the enrollment potential in these areas over the next nine years.
- The charts are divided into three sections: **K-6**, **7-9** and **10-12**.
- Each chart provides **current enrollment data for each school in the four high school feeder systems.** This includes student populations in the 4 cities: Sandy, Cottonwood Heights, Draper and Midvale.
- In addition to potential student enrollment in these four feeder systems, these charts also compare the local student enrollment figures with projected enrollment on a district wide level.

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

- 1. If a new district were to be formed that included all four cities in this study then the student population in this district would remain stable with slight growth (from 34,089 potential students in 2006 to 34,735 by 2015).
- 2. If the new district only included Cottonwood Heights, Sandy and Midvale, there would be a slight decline in student enrollment because most of the east side growth in Jordan District is taking place in Draper. Without the Alta feeder system, a slight decline would occur over the next nine years (from 22,865 students in 2006 to 21,787 students by 2015).
- 3. In comparison to the four city projected enrollments, the district wide student potential would increase from 79,207 students in 2006 to 114,494 students by the year 2015.
- 4. If the four cities in this study were to combine in forming a new school district, the remaining students in Jordan District would drop to an estimated 45,118 students in 2006 and increase to 79,759 students by 2015.

#### ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES REMAINING IN JORDAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### **ADVANTAGES**

- Jordan District is a well established entity with a significant fund balance, a nationally recognized superintendent, and experienced administrators and staff.
- The policies, procedures and educational practices of JSD well thought out and administered. As a result, Jordan District has a very sound reputation whose primary goal is to meet the diverse needs of all students served in their schools.
- Asset redistribution could still be somewhat problematic given the lack of clarity in H.B. 77 (especially with regard to district facilities and programs that now serve the entire district and could not be duplicated without additional costs.
- There is new awareness by school districts about the autonomous decision making power of individual cities (brought about by H.B. 77). As a result, cities paying a significant share of local property taxes to help build new schools (primarily on the west end of the district) should see increased sensitivity to the capital expenditure and building remodeling and replacement needs of east side schools.
- Jordan District has demonstrated remarkable cooperation and released all data, regardless of how sensitive that data might be. They have shown the utmost integrity in their willingness to paint a clear and accurate picture of all issues.
- Jordan District's size allows them to keep schools open when they are not occupied at capacity because their funding stream allows for more flexibility with spending. In short schools below student capacity cost more money per student.
- Cities that are growing and located in the west portion of Jordan District will be much more satisfied and less burdened with potential future increased tax rates.

#### **DISADVANTAGES**

- Jordan District still has 211 million dollars in voter authorized bonds that they plan to issue over the next four years. Also, they are planning to receive authorization for 400 million dollars in additional bonds within the next few years. If this money is primarily set aside for new building in the west then the tax burden of east side cities will become increasingly disproportionate. Currently, the east side cities are providing 57.3% of the local tax effort with a student population of 43.8%. This number will decrease to 30.3% of the students by the year 2015 according to Jordan District's enrollment growth projections.
- ALL ADVANTAGES LISTED IN THE DOCUMENT ABOUT FORMING A NEW SCHOOL DISTRICT WILL BE DISADVANTAGES IF EAST SIDE CITIES REMAIN IN THE CURRENT JORDAN DISTRICT.

## ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF COMBINING WITH SANDY, DRAPER AND MIDVALE CITIES

#### **ADVANTAGES**

• Jordan District debt service tax rates are currently at their lowest level in the past four years. Establishing a new school district prior to issuance of the next 211 million dollars in bonds, will cap the debt service still owed to Jordan District by all cities in this study and result in declining debt service each year thereafter.

#### If all 4 cities in this study decide to combine and form a new school district then:

- 1. Current school feeder systems will not be disrupted by the district split.
- 2. The new district would begin with a capital outlay levy that generates over 31 million dollars annually beyond money reserved for debt service to JSD.
- **3.** The new district would be in an excellent position to negotiate access to or shared usage of most district facilities currently located in Sandy or Midvale.
- **4.** With stable or slight growth projected in these four cities (when Draper is included) a new school **district would not be faced with declining enrollment** and subsequent shrinking state and federal funding streams.
- 5. The new district would still have a total funding budget of \$315 more per student than the adjusted Jordan School District (even deducting the current debt service owed by these cities to Jordan District.
- **6.** If Midvale is included in the split then the new district will **maintain or see a slight increase in federal funding** based primarily on family poverty.
- 7. The new district with just over 32,000 students would still be large enough to maintain all services and opportunities now available to students in JSD.
- **8.** The adjusted Jordan School District will still realize a higher funding per pupil than many other districts in the State. As a result, there would be no increased taxation of properties until more bonds are issued for west side growth.

#### **DISADVANTAGES**

- Jordan School District will have to do some significant District Office restructuring even though the remaining school feeder systems will be intact.
- Once new bonds are issued for more facility construction, there will be an increase in property taxes for the residential and commercial properties in JSD.
- Because the formation of a new school district in Utah has not occurred in many years, this would be a substantial venture with some unforeseen obstacles and unintended consequences.
- While this feasibility study has not discovered any substantial problems for a new school district, remaining in Jordan School District is a known factor with clear and predictable outcomes.

# ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF COMBINING WITH HOLLADAY, SOUTH SALT LAKE AND THE UNINCORPORATED MILLCREEK TOWNSHIP

#### **ADVANTAGES**

- Granite District has a lower tax rate when compared to that of Jordan School District. (.006477 compared with .007347 for the 2006-2007 school year.
- Granite District has no debt and they have adopted the philosophy of "pay as you go" so it does not appear that they have future plans to issue bonds for growth.
- Proactive citizen groups in Holladay, South Salt Lake and Millcreek Township who are supportive of giving serious consideration to the feasibility of forming a of a multi city school district separate from Granite District.

#### **DISADVANTAGES**

- Cottonwood Heights would continue to be required to pay its share of current debt service in Jordan District until all bonds are retired in 2021. This obligation is currently .001320 and would bring Cottonwood Heights total tax rate to .007797. This would be more than JSD's current property tax rate.
- C.H. City would be joining with other cities that are **currently all in a slightly declining mode of student enrollment.** This means that from the outset, the new district would be faced with possible downsizing issues and shrinking state funds.
- H.B. 77 requires that negotiated agreements remain in place for the teachers and
  other employees based on current district agreements. Therefore, a merger with
  cities to the north of Cottonwood Heights would mean that two separate
  negotiated agreements would have to be considered. This would create undue
  complications from the outset of the formation of a new school district.
- The Brighton High School feeder system would result in a split of potential student enrollment. Sandy and Cottonwood Heights now share these schools.
- Sandy students who now attend schools in Cottonwood Heights City would have to pursue and receive special permits to attend schools now in a separate district Otherwise, they would have to enroll in schools still within JSD's boundaries.
- Asset transfer decisions would be much more controversial with regard to any facilities located in Cottonwood Heights City. This is because the current boundaries of some of those schools overlap into Sandy City.